

**WICHITA HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES**  
**9 JULY 2001**  
**CITY HALL, 455 N. MAIN, 10TH FLOOR-MAPD CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**3:00 P.M.**

---

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was held Monday, July 9, 2001, at 3:00 P.M. in the Metropolitan Area Planning Department's Conference Room, City Hall-Tenth Floor, 455 N. Main, Wichita, Kansas.

Members Present: Randal Steiner  
Bryan Barr  
Kim Edgington  
Claire Willenberg  
Jim Guy (Vice Chair)  
Keith Lawing (Chair)  
Stan Sheldon

Staff Present: Kathy Morgan, Historic Preservation Planner  
Lisa Estrada, Recording Secretary  
Mike Gable, OCI Residential Permits

Absent: Sam Lentz  
Valerie Robinson  
Ex Officio, Heidi Dressler-Kelly, City Historian

**ITEM NO. 1      ROLL CALL**

***The meeting was called to order and board members stated their name.***

**LAWING:** Called the meeting to order. Thank you all for coming today, this is the first board meeting after new appointment by the City Council, so we have some business up here to conduct. I ask your patience, we will try to get through the business as quickly as possible so we can hear the cases that are before us today.

**ITEM NO. 2      ADDITIONS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

*Bylaws of the Historic Preservation Board, Article IV, Section states that officers of the board shall be President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President and shall be elected annually. Although not specified in the bylaws, the board traditionally elects officers at the first meeting in July to coincide with official board appointments.*

**LAWING:** Kathy do you have any additions or adjustment to the agenda?

**MORGAN:** Yes I do. I have two new applications, one for 1330 S. Main, and one for HPC 2001-00100. I have lost my train of thought and I can't tell you what that's for. The other thing is item number 22. Mr. Snowden has asked that he be deferred until the next meeting. He did not have all of his documentation together.

**LAWING:** Did you have a case number on the 1330 S. Main?

**MORGAN:** Yes, HPC2001-00099.

**LAWING:** The first item under Item No. 2 is the election of officers. We have a couple of new members here and there are a couple of members missing, currently, I am more than willing to defer this item until later on in the meeting, or Kathy unless there is not, there is Stan and Sam that are not here, can we maybe defer the election of officers until the August meeting?

**MORGAN:** Either that or until the end of this meeting would be fine. You are currently the First Vice President of the board and so you can conduct the meeting until we do get election of officers that would be fine.

**LAWING:** Is there any feelings from the board on that? If Stan and Sam arrive by the end of the meeting then we will do that.

**MORGAN:** We do have Patsy from the City Clerks office, if we could stop and have her swear the new officers in, Bryan has already been sworn in.

(Tape turned off during swearing in)

**LAWING:** We proceed and do the roll call and what I would like to do is take this opportunity to welcome our two new members. Kim Edgington and Bryan Barr to the board. Lets start with you Kim, give us a brief introduction of what brought you to this board.

1. Election of officers

**KIM EDGINGTON:** I work for a local civil engineering firm as a land use and zoning consultant. I am a past employee of the Planning Department, so I am quite familiar with some of the inter workings. I am very interested in historic structures, I live in one and I hope that my service can help preserve some of the wonderful things that Wichita has to offer.

**LAWING:** Give us as much information as you would like.

**CLAIRE WILLENBERG:** I'm a realtor with JP Weigand.

**KEITH LAWING:** I work at the Wichita State University, Center for Urban Studies.

**JIM GUY:** A lawyer.

**BRYAN BARR:** I work for Intrust Bank, and I have a background in history, specifically environmental history.

**MIKE GABLE:** I am the residential permit examiner.

**KATHY MORGAN:** I am the Historic Preservation Planner.

**LISA ESTRADA:** Recording Secretary

**MORGAN:** Staff would prefer that you do it today. Sam is going to have to be replaced he cannot serve another term.

**LAWING:** We have a request from staff and we always like to please staff, it is according to the bylaws of the Historic Preservation Board this board will have a President, a 1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-President. We are here at this point, the past president Paul Cavanaugh was not reappointed to this board, I have been 1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President and that is why I chaired this meeting, I think the process is pretty simple of nominating a person, a victim, so to speak for any of these three slots. I put that out.

(Back to item on election of officer after vote on HPC2001-00100)

**MORGAN:** Claire currently holds 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President.

**GUY:** I nominate Keith Lawing as President.

**MOTION #12** Motion (Guy: Motioned)  
(Willenberg 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** I am very flattered and I appreciate that.

**WILLENBERG:** You did an excellent job chairing.

**LAWING:** I watched Bob Knight for a while, he give you some good advice?

**MORGAN:** So are we entertaining them separately?

**GUY:** Lets do them one at a time.

**LAWING:** There is a motion on the table; it's been seconded, any discussion? All in favor say aye, opposed. We now have an opening for 1st Vice-President, any nominations from the board.

**WILLENBERG:** I was going to nominate Jim Guy.

**LAWING:** We have a motion to nominate Jim Guy, as 1st Vice-President is there a second?

**SHELDON:** Sheldon 2nds.

**LAWING:** It's been seconded, any further discussion.

**MOTION #13** Motion (Willenberg: Motioned)  
(Sheldon 2nd) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**GUY:** Thank you, the nice thing is that you attend all the meetings. I never had to do anything.

**LAWING:** That is what I was saying with Paul. We now have an opening for 2nd Vice-President on the board. Claire you have done a great job entertaining a motion.

**MORGAN:** Is that a motion Stan?

**SHELDON:** It is.

**LAWING:** Is that a second? We have a second, any further discussion, all in favor. Motion carries we now have officers in place for 2001-2002 terms for Historic Preservation.

**MORGAN:** For the new the new officers I need you to sign the oath of office after the meeting adjourns.

**ITEM NO. 3** **REVOLVING LOAN FUND UPDATE**

Revolving Loan Fund – Residential	\$ 55,000.00
Revolving Loan Fund – Non-residential	\$ 95,000.00
Deferred Loan Fund – Residential	\$100,000.00

**MORGAN:** Currently we have \$55,000 in the residential revolving loan fund, \$95,000 in the non-residential and \$100,000 in the deferred. We have several applications submitted that are on the agenda for consideration today.

**ITEM NO. 4** **CORRESPONDENCE**

**MORGAN:** I did give you a copy of a one-page sheet about an upcoming tax credit seminar that is being held by the State. If anybody in the audience would like a copy please leave your name and a mailing address and I can send that to you. The State of Kansas passed a bill this spring allowing for 25% Historic income tax credit for State and National register listed properties, for either residential, homeowner occupied or commercial structures. It is new to this State; we are looking forward to getting that program underway. This will be a one-day Seminar in Topeka as to how that tax credit works.

**LAWING:** Any other items under Correspondence?

**MORGAN:** No, nothing else.

**LAWING:** Are there any question from board members about the Seminar? Welcome Stan, we just discussed the correspondence before you about the tax credit.

**Stan Sheldon arrived at 3:06 p.m.**

**ITEM NO. 5** **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE 14 MAY 2001 MEETING AND 11 JUNE 2001 MEETING**

*Defer the May 14 minutes until next meeting approval of minutes, to reflect changes as requested by Keith Lawing*

**LAWING:** I think we have a parliamentary question here, because due to new appointments and with the absence of Mr. Lentz we do not have a quorum of those attendees at the May meeting to approve those minutes, I would ask that we defer approval of the May minutes and consider approval of the June minutes. I believe we have four of us here that were at that meeting. Have the board members had a chance to review those? Are there any corrections or additions

to the minutes? Hearing none I would like to make one correction, Kathy on page 5 towards the bottom, I am quoted as referring to Olathe Kansas, I think that should be Waco Street. It has been a long time since I have been to Olathe, and I do remember the conversation discussing the bakery project. With that correction, I would entertain a motion to approve.

**MOTION #1**

(SHELDON: Motioned)

(Guy 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (4-2) Approved  
Edgington and Barr abstaining, new members.

**ITEM NO. 6      OLD BUSINESS**

1.      **MAJOR:**                      (HPC2000-00111) Environs Old County Courthouse  
         **APPLICANT:**              Architectural Innovations, Brad Doeden  
         **FOR:**                         520 N. Broadway

*Applicant is submitting project for design review of Lord's Diner. The board reviewed the demolition of the structure located at 520 N. Broadway, but did not review the building design. A rendering provided by the architect has been included in your packet. The roof dominates the structure. Lowering the roof pitch and using gables as opposed to hipped gables should be considered. The use of materials is sympathetic to the surrounding structures and the setback is appropriate in relationship to the adjacent institutional structures. With the adjustment of the gables and the roof pitch, this design would meet the intent of Standard #6 as set forth in the Standards and Guidelines for Environs Review as published by the Kansas State Historic Preservation Office which reads as follows:*

**#6**      *New additions, exterior alterations, infill construction, or related new construction should not destroy character-defining features or spatial relationships that characterize the environs of a property. The new work shall be compatible with the historic materials, character-defining features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the environs.*

**LAWING:** From old business HPC2001-00111 Environs of the Old County Courthouse; this would be a project that we have seen before at sometime, but Kathy it looks like we did not follow all the procedures or we need to do some more reviewing.

**MORAN:** Correct, what we did at that time was the demolition permit; we did not discuss the design review. We have Brad Doeden, the architect here. This is a site plan and this site plan remains pretty much the same for the new construction. What we have is the color rendering that was provided last year. This rendering was provided most recently. Brad has brought some samples. The concerns that staff had I in reviewing this; it appears that the pitch of the roof and maybe this is just a computer generated problem, but it appears that the pitch of the roof is different than what was originally submitted. I guess our concern was; with the pitch on this roof, is more in keeping it does not draw so much attention to the roof line as does this. They are going to use the red tile roof. Therefore, it is more of a question of the pitch of the roof and not so much any more of the materials being used. That was the only comment that staff had to make about the project. Bran is there anything that you would like to further add on this project?

**BRAD DOEDEN:** I would like to address the materials, the pitch of the roof and the design change that might give that perception that the pitch of the roof has changed. Can you go back to the slide that shows the floor plan please?

**MORGAN:** That?

**DOEDEN:** Yes. What has happened is that the design of the dinning area has been expanded in two directions. It has been expanded to the right, which is to the south and it has been expanded to the west. So it is now more of an L shape. Therefore, it comes out to about like this.

**LAWING:** Is that increasing the square footage of the facility?

**DOEDEN:** The square footage of the facility is increased. We had talked about having the ability to expand the dinning facility in the future. This expansion, says that this facility is now at its maximum footprint. There is no more space; the site would not allow any more expansion. It gives the perception that the roof pitch has changed; in reality the pitch has stayed the same, it's just that the dinning facility has just gotten bigger. The kitchen area has stayed the same square footage wise; we tweaked the layout of the kitchen just to make the thing flow a little bit better and differently. It was originally sized for 450 people and that is what the dinning facility would be able to feed 450 people in two sittings. The

actual dinning capacity is for 287. The materials I brought with me would be; if you could go back to one of the most recent elevations, you will see three different materials. The roof material, which will be a red clay tile to match the Presbyterian Church on the west side on Broadway and then there will be limestone, split face limestone which will be on the base of the building and near or above the windows. A band at the top; just below the fascia band would be a limestone and then the intermediate material would be a blond color brick. I brought a sample of the color and material and they are over here. This being the intermediate material, this would be on the bottom, then this would be above the brick, and this would be the red clay tile. The exact pattern of the roof (showing the materials to board) is going to be barrel-like but not necessarily traditional barrel roof tile. We tried to come up with something that would match the Presbyterian Church but we were unable to find something that was exact, but we found something similar. The windows would be anodized dark bronze and with a reflective type glass. There will be some dryvit, the color in essence would be a light blond or a beige color dryvit; on the part where you see the dinning name and around the fascia would be dryvit or similar like material.

**LAWING:** Board members do you have any questions of Mr. Doeden? Staff any comments?

**MORGAN:** No, again the reason for reviewing this is as I mentioned; it appeared that the roof pitch had increased and the peak was higher than what was originally presented. We thought the changes to the columns and that were much better with this design. That was the only comment we really had; that the roof did not become the prominent element of that design.

**DOEDEN:** I think there is still time that I can at least look at trying to minimizing the roof; I appreciate those comments, and see if we can accommodate that in some way. Although with not looking at it right now, I can't promise that.

**SHELDON:** Is that a 4 X 12 pitch?

**DOEDEN:** No it is not.

**SHELDON:** Is it steeper than that?

**DOEDEN:** Yes it is.

**SHELDON:** Cause you can't really go with that kind of tile, you can't go below with a 4 x 12 for sure and even 4 x 12 is kind of hefty with that tile of roof, usually 5 x 12 is normal for a tile.

**DOEDEN:** Yes, we have it as a 5 x 12 pitch right now.

**LAWING:** Any other questions for Mr. Doeden? Mr. Doeden do you have anything you would to add?

**DOEDEN:** I don't believe so; I appreciate you giving us the opportunity to share.

**LAWING:** Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience who would also like to address the board on this issue? Seeing none, I would bring the discussion back to the board; any comments or questions from staff about this project?

**SHELDON:** Would you go back to the previous slide prior to this? I like this rendering myself, I think he has made some nice changes; it has more of a substantial look to it in some ways. I like the detailing of it, the gable and the entire piece, by clipping it, it makes a nice features.

**WILLENBERG:** I like the limestone.

**LAWING:** So Kathy we are being asked to determine if this negatively impacts the environs of the Old County Courthouse?

**MORGAN:** Right, yes, that your finding would be that the design of this new structure does not significantly or negatively impact the environs of the Old County Courthouse, If that is your wish.

**LAWING:** Unless there is further discussion, I would entertain a motion on the question before us.

**SHELDON:** I would move that this new proposal for this building does not significantly negative impact the environs of the Old County Courthouse.

Page 6 of 27

**LAWING:** There has been a motion and a second, any discussion, asking for a vote. The aye's have it.

**MOTION #2** (Sheldon: Motioned)  
(Willenberg 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** We have a whole slue of minor applications that have been reviewed by staff, does the board have any questions about any of the items here?

**MORGAN:** I have one item I would like to show you here. There is one item that should have been a major but somehow got past us. I went to the site; this was a strip center at the corner of 16<sup>th</sup> and Hillside within the environs of the Fairmount Cottage.

**LAWING:** This is number 18 on our agenda?

**MORGAN:** Yes, when I got out there they had already started wrecking the building. It had been damaged by fire. There is a solid line of trees that separate the neighborhood from the strip center. Since they had already started the project staff went ahead and approved it, and made note that it was a Major C of A and staff approved it because of the situation.

**WILLENBERG:** I have a question for installing banners for the River Festival, is that for next year?

**MORGAN:** No, if you will recall, we suspended the reviewing of a minor C of As, because it was held off site. So the majority of these should have been reviewed at the June meeting, but were not. That is why you have things back that far.

**WILLENBERG:** the April meeting, because it would have been in May right?

**MORGAN:** But these items were for when River Festival was, May 24 thru 21 or something like that, and these applications did not come in until after the April meeting, so they were caught in limbo.

**WILLENBERG:** I thought you were planning ahead for next year.

**MORGAN:** No, I am not trying to do that.

**LAWING:** Any other items folks about the items, seeing none, I would be willing to entertain a motion that we receive and file these applications.

## ITEM NO. 7 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

1. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00056) Environs Wheeler, Kelly, Hagney Bldg.  
**APPLICANT:** Mahaney Roofing  
**FOR:** 101 S. Market

Applicant proposes to replace roof with new insulation and modified bitumen roofing.

2. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00057) Environs Sternberg House  
**APPLICANT:** Pedro Ibarra  
**FOR:** 1107 N. Jackson

Applicant proposes to replace roof on house with same type materials – composite shingle.

3. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00060) Environs Occidental Hotel  
**APPLICANT:** Martin Roofing  
**FOR:** 271 W. 3rd

Applicant proposes to repair roof with modified built up roof.

4. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00061) Environs Campbell Castle

**APPLICANT:** Wichita Roofing  
**FOR:** 1509 W. Briggs

Applicant proposes to re-roof house and detached garage.

5. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00062) Environs Wholesale Grocery  
**APPLICANT:** Ron's Signs  
**FOR:** 811 E. Waterman

Applicant proposes to change existing sign face.

6. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00063) Environs Rock Island Depot  
**APPLICANT:** Standard Beverage  
**FOR:** 711 E. Douglas

Applicant proposes install banners for River Festival.

7. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00065) Topeka/Emporia Historic District  
**APPLICANT:** Gottschalk Brothers Roofing  
**FOR:** 1247 N. Emporia

Applicant proposes to re-roof house with Elk Shingle.

8. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00066) Hillside Cottage  
**APPLICANT:** Harold C. Miner  
**FOR:** 303 S. Circle

Applicant proposes to repair/replace stone with matching material and re-point using appropriate mortar mix.

9. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00067) Noble House  
**APPLICANT:** Mitch Willis  
**FOR:** 3120 N. Mead

Applicant proposes to re-roof house with Heritage II shingles.

10. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00068) Topeka/Emporia Historic District  
**APPLICANT:** Eagle Construction  
**FOR:** 1320 N. Topeka

Applicant proposes to re-roof house with 3-tab shingles.

11. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00077) Environs Hayford Bldg  
**APPLICANT:** Wray Roofing  
**FOR:** 255 N. Main

Applicant proposes to repair built-up roof with modified bitumen material.

12. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00078) Environs Stackman Court Apartments  
**APPLICANT:** Richard Fair Roofing  
**FOR:** 832 N. Faulkner

Applicant proposes to re-roof house with 3-tab composition shingles.

13. **MINOR:** (HPC2001-00081) Wholesale Grocery  
**APPLICANT:** Trimark Signworks  
**FOR:** 619 E. William

Applicant proposes to make name change on existing signs from "Warehouse" to "Works".

14.     **MINOR:**                     (HPC2001-00082) Environs Campbell Castle  
          **APPLICANT:**           Herzberg Roofing  
          **FOR:**                   1202 N. Coolidge

Applicant proposes to re-roof house and detached garage with Heritage 25 shingles.

15.     **MINOR:**                     (HPC2001-00083) Environs Wholesale Grocery  
          **APPLICANT:**           Dawney's Auto Upholstery  
          **FOR:**                   326 S. Commerce

Applicant proposes to repair built-up roof with modified bitumen material.

16.     **MINOR:**                     (HPC2001-00084) Environs Senator Long House  
          **APPLICANT:**           Wichita Roofing  
          **FOR:**                   254 N. Holyoke

Applicant proposes to re-roof house and detached shed with 3-tab composition shingles.

17.     **MINOR:**                     (HPC2001-00087) Environs Allen House  
          **APPLICANT:**           Wichita Roofing  
          **FOR:**                   259 N. Quention

Applicant proposes to remove tile roof, re-felt and re-flash and replace roof tile.

18.     **MAJOR:**                     (HPC2001-00090) Environs Fairmount Cottage  
          **APPLICANT:**           Bradburn Wrecking  
          **FOR:**                   1680 N. Hillside

*Applicant proposes to demolish fire damaged strip center.*

*Certificates of Appropriateness 56, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 87 were reviewed and approved by staff as per Historic Preservation Board policy. C of A HPC2001-00090 was reviewed by staff after demolition was approximately 50% complete. Staff conducted an on-site review and determined there was no significant negative impact to the environs of Fairmount Cottage and approved the C of A.*

*Board action to receive and file the above Certificates of Appropriateness.*

**LAWING:** We have a motion to approve C of A's under Item No. 7, 1-18, any discussion, seeing none,

**MOTION #3**                     (Sheldon: Motioned)  
                                      (Guy 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

19.     **MAJOR:**                     (HPC2001-00074)  
          **APPLICANT:**           Sandra Baker  
          **FOR:**                   910 W. Murdock

*Applicant is requesting approval of scope of work for an Historic Revolving Loan for mechanical system repairs. This financial application is in process and should have all staff review and City Manager review completed by July 9. Should this application meet staff review requirements, HPB will consider the scope of work. The scope does meet the Revolving Loan Guidelines and staff recommends approval of the scope of work.*

**MORGAN:** This is 910 West Murdock. This property is located within the 1919 City limits, which is our designated boundary for our Revolving Loan Program. This house is right across the street from the Canon and Civil War Solider in Riverside Park. The property owner is doing some needed electrical repairs for minor housing code violations that needed upgrading. Then there were a few plumbing items that needed to be addressed. They are eligible for a \$5,000 loan because they are not individually listed. That is where we are with this property owner. It has been review by staff; credit worthiness has been ascertained; and at this point is awaiting approval by the Historic Preservation Board, so that the loan package can be processed. Again, this would be a \$5,000 loan.



**LAWING:** Just one single \$5,000 loan?

**MORGAN:** Right.

**LAWING:** It is not broken up into different projects. Are there any questions from staff on this; seeing none, anyone willing to make a motion to approve?

**GUY:** I move that Major Certificate of Appropriateness HPC2001-00074 be approved as presented.

**MOTION #4** (Guy: Motioned)  
(Sheldon 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** Is there a second, any discussion, seeing none, ask for a vote, by saying aye, opposed nays, the aye have it. Number 20 looks like another request for a Revolving Loan application at 1905 N. Park Place.

20. **MAJOR:** (HPC2001-00089) Steinbuchel House  
**APPLICANT:** David Cullen  
**FOR:** 1905 Park Place

*Applicant is requesting approval of scope of work for an Historic Revolving Loan for foundation, window, masonry and electrical system repair/replacement. This financial application is in process and should have all staff review and City Manager review completed by July 9. Should this application meet staff review requirements, HPB will consider the scope of work. The scope does meet the Revolving Loan Guidelines and staff recommends approval of the scope of work.*

**MORGAN:** We have David Cullen here, do you want to come to the podium. There are some major repairs. They are wanting to do some repair to the foundation, and I think you have a copy of that work. A cellar door needs to be repaired/replaced, to provide security to the basement. David I don't know what window wells you were looking at repairing in the basement.

**CULLEN:** All of them?

**MORGAN:** There were some electrical items in that, I do need to make note of one thing. You were going to finish off the third floor and put a separate electrical service up to the third floor?

**CULLEN:** We want to run a service panel to the third floor for eventual expansion. We are not going to start on the third floor yet.

**MORAN:** The guidelines state that we don't use financing the loan program to extend finish space interior space. I think that was a \$927 item that would not be considered under this loan. The loan amount was for almost \$25,000, and it is going to City Council for final approval. If with the removal of that should fall below that amount it would not have to go to City Council.

**CULLEN:** I think with the removal it should cost less than \$25,000.

**MORAGN:** It would not have to go to City Council if under \$25,000. In addition, a portion was to replace the boiler system.

**CULLEN:** We are going to move out of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and into the 21<sup>st</sup>.

**WILLENBERG:** Are you staying with the steam heat?

**CULLEN:** We don't have steamed heat we have hot water.

**WILLENBERG:** Are you moving to forced air?

**CULLEN:** No we are staying with hot water, with the new boiler.

**WILLENBERG:** Good.

**LAWING:** Any questions of Mr. Cullen? The projects he is undertaken. I commend you on your efforts; I drive by your house on my way to work. I appreciate what you have done. Staff if we have your approval, I think we do, this is a very worthwhile loan, I would make a motion to approve HPC2001-00089 in the amount of \$25,000?

**MORGAN:** It is just a little under \$25,000. I will get that figure from Mr. Holliman and enter that into the minutes if you will for approval at next meeting.

**LAWING:** Willenberg 2nd, do we have any further discussion? Hearing none, lets ask for a vote by saying aye, opposed nays, and the aye have it.

**MOTION #5** (Lawing: Motioned)  
(Willenberg 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** Good luck Mr. Cullen. Next item. No. 21, HPC 2001-00091, 438 N. Topeka.

21. **MAJOR:** (HPC2001-00091) Environs Navarre/Nokomis Apts  
**APPLICANT:** Nathan Wilkey and Rob Patton  
**FOR:** 438 N. Topeka

*Applicant proposes to demolish abandoned property. Staff is in the process of completing the historic research of this structure and will provide additional information at the board meeting. The structure is in substandard shape and has a housing case filed against it.*

**MORGAN:** Is Nathan here? You are Rob? Rob Patton is co-owner of this property. This is a new property in our bank, because this apartment building is the one that these folks currently own and just to the south of that is the Navarre/Nokomis apartments that were just recently placed on the National Register. This is the existing property, I did several searches for information about this property, did not find any association with a builder, any kind of historical ties that might lead the board to think we ought to do something about preserving the structure because of its association with early Wichita. It is a two-story house; it has been vacant for several years and is dilapidated. There is another front on picture. All of the siding has been removed from the house. This is the rear of the building. I don't understand from this, were you going to take out this little one-story structure?

**PATTON:** No, we would like to keep that and tear down the house.

**MORGAN:** There are apartments in that and it appears to be in good condition. However, here you can see the porch, the back porch there; this is a shot from the south side looking toward the east elevation of the building. This little one-story, white stucco structure would remain. The plan is to remove the two-story house and they will landscape it and provide some off-street parking I believe for the tenants in your building, is that correct?

**PATTON:** Yes.

**MORGAN:** I will go back and show you this; this is the existing apartment building. They have put in quite a bit of work in maintaining it.

**PATTON:** The building on the right is ours and we have put a lot of money in it. This had code violations this house, which we just purchased has had violations for years, so we would like to level it and make a parking lot.

**LAWING:** Any question of Mr. Patton by board members or staff?

**SHELDON:** How much off street parking is this going to create?

**PATTON:** Whatever we can fit into that space that the building is on.

**MORGAN:** They would work with our landscaping person. This is within the Central Business District, so they are not required to landscape, but Nathan had indicated to me that they would do something to maintain this street edge here; it would not just be asphalt with lines painted on it.

**LAWING:** So the access to the lot would be from the rear, the alleyway there? I mean you would not have access

right there of the street?

**MORGAN:** It is my understanding that you all were going to come in from this way; there is parking behind there building right here.

**PATTON:** This is where our tenants park, where that van is right now; we have a four-plex next door.

**MORGAN:** So there would be the opportunity to open this area up to where they could get into that parking and not come off of from the street. It would be entered from the alley.

**LAWING:** Questions or comments by board members?

**SHELDON:** There are four units?

**PATTON:** The building we currently own, yes.

**MORGAN:** In this structure?

**PATTON:** This is our house that we have fixed up.

**LAWING:** And one other to the south, correct?

**PATTON:** Yes, there are actually two units in those white building to the south.

**LAWING:** Well folks, what's your pleasure? Kathy, we are being asked to approve the demolition right here?

**MORGAN:** Right and what you are saying is; that there is not a significant negative impact to the environs of the Navarre/Nokomis National Registered, listed structure.

**PATTON:** Where is that structure?

**MORGAN:** The two apartment buildings just to the South of yours?

**PATTON:** South of us?

**WILLENBERG:** Is this in the area of the City, Central Business Venture of where they were going to do the CORE area?

**MORGAN:** Yes it is but I think that might have been outside of Phase I. I remember having that discussion with the CORE representatives, I think it was Tony Rangel that presented that plan. This area would be in Phase II if that plan ever gets off the ground.

**WILLENBERG:** As much as I hate to see an existing structure demolished, the neighborhood is probably improved by having landscaped parking in their rather than that structure.

**MORGAN:** As I said we went through City directories and searched the newspapers. I found no compelling information to prevent the demolition of this structure.

**PATTON:** There have been transients living here, some of our tenants think this has been a crack house in the past and so we have been trying to work with the previous owner and we finally just decided to buy it and take care of it ourselves. I looked at what it could cost us to fix it and it won't cash flow. This is the next best thing we can do.

**LAWING:** I went by and look at that property and I agree with Claire, I don't like the idea of taking down an existing structure but, to me the presence of that building is a actually a negative impact on the environs of the historical property in question. Based on my limited knowledge of what it would take, just my estimate, taking a look at that house, I would agree with you Mr. Patton, it probably is not cost affective for somebody to completely rehab that facility like it need to be.

**PATTON:** Unless you could provide us with funds.

**WILLENBERG:** We have a great loan program.

**LAWING:** That might get the porch.

**MORGAN:** Plus there is the possibility of the 25% investment tax credit that is available now, where it might not have been available when you were looking at into that. If you want to take the time and see if there is any incentive that could help the project cash flow, other wise the board could go ahead and say approve the demolition if you will.

**PATTON:** Yes, if we could do it that way, get approval for that, I will look at it. But with our own money it makes no since to get back to code and get it livable so that we could attract some decent tenants.

**MORGAN:** All right.

**LAWING:** Does that sound like an exceptional option members? Mr. Guy? Well I guess I am ready to entertain a motion that we would...How would I word this...

**GUY:** That the demolition of the structure would not encroach upon, damage or destroy the environs of...

**LAWING:** With the stipulation that research be done pertaining to the possibility of tax credits, having the structure remains there viable.

**MOTION #6** (Lawing: Motioned)  
(Guy 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**MORGAN:** I will get with you tomorrow and you can start working on that.

**LAWING:** It has been seconded, any discussion? Hearing none, lets ask for a vote by saying aye, opposed nays, the aye's have it. Kathy could you be sure to bring this up to the board at the next meeting under old business just to tell us what the results of this were of this and we will have an idea of what is going on.

We are at Item No. 22, which has been deferred.

22. **MAJOR:** (HPC2001-00092) Environs Steinbuchel House  
**APPLICANT:** Alan Snowden  
**FOR:** 1919 Wellington

*Applicant proposes to build a freestanding carport. This application came in late and complete documentation is not available. Staff will provide information prior to board meeting.*

Deferred until next meeting.

**LAWING:** Lets go to Item No. 8. Miscellaneous Matters, we do have two additions lets go ahead and put those on after we deal with the Linwood Park issue. We can do that at the very last.

23. **MAJOR:** (HPC2001-00099) Environs Monroe/Mahan House  
**APPLICANT:** Troung A Ha  
**FOR:** 1330 S. Main

*Applicant proposes to install vinyl siding, replace windows with vinyl windows and replace wood porch with concrete porch.*

**MORGAN:** The property owners are here, if you could come up to the microphone please. This is behind the Monroe/Mahan House; it is a single story clapboard siding.

**LAWING:** Kathy could you hold on one second, lets give a couple minutes, we have some more business folks, if you are going to have conversations if you could carry those on out in the hall, we will try to get through the rest of our agenda. If you need to speak to staff after the meeting, we will be done with this in a few minutes.

**MORGAN:** This has 3 to 3 ½ inch clapboard siding, it also has in the gable ends and on the porch, and you can see the fish scale siding. The property owners want to install vinyl siding. They had requested for 5" lap siding. They were also requesting vinyl replacement windows for the structure and the front porch needs repairing; they want to put in a concrete porch. In the past, the Preservation Board has approved vinyl siding with the condition that the siding matches the original profile of the existing wood siding. The other consideration here is the porch windows particularly on this pair are oversized. In actuality, this window has two sections to it. It has the upper shorter sections where you see the mullions creating a diamond pattern, and then a large single pane. That is a defining feature of this structure so in replacing this with vinyl windows it would have to be a special ordered window. It has been done in the past but they have had to maintain or replicate the original fenestration. That is what has been done in the past for this type of project. What else do we have?

**WILLENBERG:** Fish scales?

**MORGAN:** Yes, that the fish scales; this window has been replaced up here, it was probably a single pane with maybe some vertical mullions, but there is no way of knowing so; obviously that was a vent or has been a vented. That is what I have available. Please give us your name if you would please. Did you sign in on the sheet up there? I have it on the application, but please state your name.

**TROUNG A HA:** My name is Troung Ha.

**MORGAN:** Is there anything else that you want to add. Did I miss any of the details that you wanted to do? I know you are doing work on the interior structure.

**WILLENBERG:** Kathy, what were they planning on doing with the fish scale?

**MORGAN:** What were you planning to do with the siding, were you just going to side it all with the 5" lap siding and cover the fish scales up in the gable ends.

**HA:** Yes.

**MORGAN:** Because what you had done, is that you had gone to one of the lumber companies, or the home improvement, Lowe's and had made arrangement to purchase the lap siding they had available which was the 5", is that correct and you were going to install it yourself?

**HA:** Yes, but if I can change the siding; and keep it all original 3 ½.

**MORGAN:** I know I spoke to you yesterday afternoon; have you had a chance to go to Lowe's and see if they have a pattern book that maybe you could get siding to match the fish scales in the gable end.

**HA:** I will try to do it, if I can get the original

**MORGAN:** Was there anything else that you needed to do, any roofing or anything like that that you needed to do?

**HA:** No the roofing is all right.

**LAWING:** Kathy, what are staff's recommendations?

**MORGAN:** Well I would recommend that if they matched the profile of the existing siding and since Mr. Ha said that if they couldn't not find something to match the fish scale that they would just leave that, and the rest could be approved. My concern would be back to the porch, I would like to see the wooden porch retained and the joist repaired or replaced with wood. I can give them a copy of the article in the Old House Journal is; when you cut the boards for the porches; particularly these ends; if they are sawed off flat, it allows for moisture to get in and rot. If they are beveled or rounded it makes the water shed so that it doesn't absorb that.

**GUY:** That is a two-part article, and the second part is in the article.

**MORGAN:** Right, I would like to see them keep the wood floor porch.

**LAWING:** What about the windows?

**MORGAN:** These two front windows I didn't inspect all of the windows on the house, there is some rot, but it could be as simple as replacing the rails or the muntins and retaining the original windows. We have in the past approved vinyl windows; it could be what needs to be done is to maintain these two large windows on the side, these are more of a standard window on the sides, I mean if the board wanted to they could let them put in the vinyl windows there. The other thing that also needs to be documented the window hoods have a quarter molding, that profile needs to be maintained when they apply the vinyl siding. The other option is this Mr. Ha, we have a Revolving Loan Funds available that if you would choose to; instead of install the vinyl siding, if you would choose to scrape and prepare the wood and paint, that you could get a loan to help assist with the cost of that.

**HA:** The frame of that is almost rot, I can not pull it up any more, my house has no air conditioning so I need to open up, most of the time and it is to hot, so I need to pull it up.

**SHELDON:** Are you saying the windows are to rotted out, I'm sorry I didn't understand.

**HA:** Some of frame has come out already. I tried and they are stuck.

**SHELDON:** They are stuck.

**HA:** Stuck and the wood frame is rot. (Interpreter) It would be easier to replace it and we would have to hire someone. The reason we bought this house was because it was cheap and we can use our labor to fix it up. That way you can save more money. We would hire someone we have to finance to do that.

**WILLENBERG:** If you were going to redo the porch, is it concrete from the columns down, what were you going to do with the railing and the porch pillars.

**HA:** We do a new concrete foundation and we would just replace old wood with new wood.

**MORGAN:** So you would keep the same railing and same porch supports on the porch.

**HA:** We keep everything the same, same height; just concrete porch and foundation around the porch would be concrete.

**LAWING:** Any other questions board members, concerns, suggestions?

**BARR:** Have you looked into you said there was substantial wood rot, have you looked into using epoxy to replace? A lot of your wood rot could be replaced by using a form of epoxy that you could later sand down; I have a hard time seeing if it's just on the seal or structural.

**HA:** The window frames and the outside glass are broke and the frame won't stay together anymore, and the string to pull it up is already broke and the pulley is rusted.

**WILLENBERG:** Could we a look at allowing replacement windows along the sides but retain the original window on the front porch? Would that be satisfactory? The front porch windows would be in better shape.

**SHELDON:** (Background discussion can not hear, too many people talking) I think I would rather see that porch the way it is.

**LAWING:** Are we getting closer to a motion? Have we figured out the scope; they will do the siding to match the existing siding; will look into the fish scales to see if that is replaceable if not they will maintain the existing structure. Suggestion has been made to allow replacement windows on the side, but maintain the original window in the front and that for the porch that they use like material, which would save them money, and to retain the existing design they have now.

**MORGAN:** Could you please verify; this window in the attic, can it be a vinyl window? Then, we are only talking about the two major windows.

**HA:** Can we change the front window, but I will retain the size of the window, but can we change the material and

do the vinyl pattern, we will try to replicate the diamond shape. We will make it the same.

**MORGAN:** I don't think staff will have a problem with that, I think you really ought to look into the cost difference in repairing the wood frame, as opposed to having a special made vinyl window. It is probably going to cost more than to repair the window or the existing window. If cost is your concern, you need to look over that very thoroughly.

**HA:** I have already looked over the price, for the window that size, and it will cost too much for me.

**MORGAN:** I didn't see any evidence of severe rot, when I was there. I don't know that you are going to have to replace the whole thing, the only thing you are going to have to do, is fix the framing and not the sashes themselves, whether you put in vinyl or wood you are going to have to change the framing.

**HA:** If you want me to change the frame I change the whole frame, the only thing I can keep on that window is the glass that is all I have. If I change the frame wood, I have to change the entire thing. We are afraid we will have to change it again, so if we use a vinyl window it will save us more money.

**SHELDON:** Maintenance on a house is a life long, on going process, no doubt about that.

**WILLENBERG:** Can we amend the motion to say either vinyl window made exact duplication of the existing or repair of the two, would that be satisfactory?

**LAWING:** I would like to ask you Kathy to work with this applicant. (End of tape)

(Start of conversation after taped was re inserted)

**WILLENBERG:** Would it agreeable to rework the porch with similar materials rather than going to the concrete is what we are suggesting?

**LAWING:** I would think, in the long run that would be cheaper.

**SHELDON:** Would he be looking at structural problems too? Would problems start appearing from a house that wasn't designed for that?

**LAWING:** Lets try to pull together the elements to try to rework the motion. We are going to move to approve the applications to put vinyl siding that is consistent with the current siding. Allow for the replacement windows on the sides to remain. The window on the front porch we will permit either vinyl replacement done in the same fashion as the current structure or rebuild with like materials. In addition, if new materials cannot be found to replace the fish scales, maintaining that and recommending that the porch be done in a similar fashion as to what it is now with like materials. Kathy did you catch that.

**MORGAN:** Got it all.

**LAWING:** That is the motion. Guy seconds. We have a motion on the table any discussion. All in favor indicating by saying aye, opposed, nay. Thank you very much. Kathy definitely we would like you to work with the applicants here and make sure that the job is done to their specifications and ours.

**MORGAN:** I will get with you tomorrow. Can I meet with you tomorrow, do you have any questions.

**HA:** So we cannot rebuild the porch with concrete?

**MORGAN:** No, you have to rebuild the porch you have to replace the wood joist and put in the wood floor. Now you do have the opportunity if you wish, you may appeal the decision of this board to the City Council. You do have that opportunity. I can meet with you tomorrow afternoon, is that convenient, I can come meet with you at the house, are you going to be there working?

**HA:** After 3:00.

**MORGAN:** After 3:00, how about I meet you at the house at 3:30.

**LAWING:** One more thing, it is the boards opinion that it would be more cost effective, cheaper for you to do the porch with like materials, than pouring a new load of cement there. We are not trying to limit you at all, we are trying to cooperative with you in trying to bring a good resolution to this so thank you for coming today, thank you for rehabbing your house, we appreciate that. Stan you had additional comments.

**SHELDON:** I want you to understand too, if I understood you correctly; you two were doing this work.

**HA:** No, we have some friends helping.

**SHELTON:** Well it is you and a group of some friends, if you understand what is really required to completely tear out that entire front porch and put in a footing in there appropriate, to pour concrete, I think you would decide not to. The amount of work that you would need to do to support that roof structure so forth as you demolish, I just think you would be surprised at the amount of work involved. What we just moved and voted on, is that you basically rework this and patch in and repair as you need to. Yes, there will be some maintenance. You will need to paint the deck with some deck stain or something and there will be some long-term maintenance. However, guess what, on concrete, you will get cracking and if you don't properly do it, you will have a significant bigger problem than the maintenance you will have on that porch, that is our opinion as well for that, or at least mine.

**WILLENBERG:** You are the Architect.

**HA:** Can we do the foundation under the porch like support the porch cause it has to hold up the support the front roof.

**SHELDON:** To build up that porch would be very easy, it is probably an issue of putting in some new wooden shims, or even some steel shims underneath some of the existing piers that are at the front end of that porch. It should not be a significant problem to jack that up if you need to. To completely redo it would be a very, major project. I guess Kathy will meet you there at 3:30 tomorrow.

**MORGAN:** We will go over that tomorrow.

**HA:** Thank you very much.

**LAWING:** We have one more addition to the agenda it is HPC2001-00100. It is a sign at 612 East Douglas, actually one door down from the Tasty Mill, next to the Barley Corn Barn and Grill I think; we had approved a signed at that location. I have a picture we will pass around to board members. Kathy do you have any comments?

24.	<b>MAJOR:</b>	(HPC2001-00100) East Douglas Historic District
	<b>APPLICANT:</b>	City of Wichita, Property Management
	<b>FOR:</b>	612 E. Douglas

*Applicant proposes to install signage for new tenant.*

**MORGAN:** No, this building is actually owned by the City and they have a new tenant, the signs are being put in the transom area for that. I can't see why they can't have it. They are not backlighted, I don't see any problem as it is, or as presented in the computer generated drawing.

**LAWING:** Any questions, Kim, anybody have any questions on that? Therefore, we need a motion to approve. I would entertain a motion to approve.

**GUY:** I would move that we approve HPC2001-00100 I think it is, as presented.

**EDGINGTON:** I will second the motion.

<b>MOTION #11</b>	Motion (Lawing: Motioned)
	(Edgington 2 <sup>nd</sup> ) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** We have a motion and a second, any further questions, hearing none, signify by saying aye, opposed, nay. The I ayes have it, approved. At the beginning of the meeting before Stan came we not with any formal vote, but decided to defer the election of officers until we had complete attendance. What is the pleasure of the board,



do we want to finish that off today or do we want to carry that over to the August meeting, and give Stan a chance to be present?

**ITEM NO. 8      MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**

*1. Friends of Linwood Park request for placing on register of historic places – Paul Fortier*

**LAWING:** Presentation by Mr. Paul Fortier, please come forward and talk to the board about the possibility of designation North Linwood Park as a Historic Resource. Mr. Fortier please state your name and address for the record.

**FORTIER:** Paul Fortier, 1257 Greenwood. Good afternoon, ladies and gentleman, I would like to thank the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department for granting us the opportunity to address this board. To make a long story much shorter, in January of 1879, Henry Schweiter, my great grandfather arrived at this place, now known as Wichita. He had traveled here alone in a covered wagon. He was an immigrant from Switzerland and a carpenter by trade.

Upon arriving here, he immediately set about homesteading a claim, which would now be near 13<sup>th</sup> Street on the Cowskin creek. He later treaded this land for 2 lots, where the three hundred block of where North Main Street is now. Here he built a carpenter shop and a home for himself. It was around this time that he and 123 other members of the now rapidly growing settlement, signed papers to petition for Incorporation as the City of Wichita. My great grand parents were married in March of 1873 and their first child was born in their home on North Main Street in January of 1876. Shortly thereafter, my great grandfather traded a team of mules and some cash for 20 acres on South Hydraulic Street; here he started farming in addition to his business interests in town. This 20 acres grew into 640 acre diversified farm while the small house grew into an 11 room, two-story home. Here my great grandparents' other 5 children were born. From humble beginnings with hard work and an entrepreneurial spirit, this man met the need of the growing community as well as those of his family, and prospered along with the town that he loved. No history of Wichita is complete without recognition of the many contributions to the many growth development of our City. It was on this farm and on the banks of Chisholm Creek that an area was selected to develop into a shaded and landscaped area, available for friends, neighbors, church and civic groups to use for picnics and outings. This area was to be included into the north 20acre tract of the 40acres offered to the City to be used for City Park. In December of 1886, a former proposition was drafted to the City. It offered 40 acres of land to be used as City Park and for no other purpose. In January of 1887, the offer was accepted by the City on these terms. This land became Wichita's first large scale public park. Due to the loss of acreage to first the drainage canal, then the I-135 Highway Project, and associated widening and elevation of Harry Street between the 2 parcels of park land, the original 20 acres of North Linwood Park, what I term is the area North of Harry Street, now consists of only 14 and 2/10s acres. This is the area, which includes the landscaped and planted picnic grounds, which was made available to others, on the farm property. This area is described in "Wichita, the Magic City," one of the latest books to be published on Wichita. It states, "that Linwood Park in 1900 was the best landscaped of the City Parks." It remains much the same as then. North Linwood Park still shows the sculpturing of the larges remaining part of the original Chisholm Creek bed, which meandered through the farm. Standing in the park one can see in the mind's eye, the lay of the land and imagine the appearance as it was in the distant past. There are also in this area of the park, trees of some significance. Many of the trees are 80 to 100 and more years old. Among these are the American Linden, English walnut, Black Locust, Burr Oak, Hackberry, Ponderosa Pine and Prairie Sycamore; some are varieties, which are unusual and hard to find elsewhere. You owe it to yourself to stroll through the park and identify as many of them as you can. Being a protected and unique eco- system for so long has encouraged a large and permanent assemblage of native wildlife. In addition to the usual and more common rabbits, squirrels and birds, there are reported to be red fox, Rio Grande turkey, American kestrels and a variety of Hawks and Owls. This park also serves migrating bird species with the old growth trees, who's high and large canopy offer a diverse and protective environment. It is a well-established oasis for wildlife as well for all of us in an otherwise urban setting. Most large cities in our country have put in place mechanisms to protect and to maximize such green spaces as these. To demonstrate community-wide support, a petition drive was started several weeks ago. People were asked to sign and support of Historic designation of North Linwood Park. Over 2,000 signatures have been returned thus far, with many more still being circulated. These are some of the petitions. As we go forward with our plans and our dreams for our descendants and ourselves, we have elements of shared history that which would be shared and remembered. North Linwood Park could well be one of these elements. The descendants of Henry Schweiter and generations of Wichitan's who have enjoyed the environs of North Linwood Park for family picnics, reunions, activities which have entertained, educated and refreshed the spirits of all who have partaken of those unique opportunities implore you to protect this area with historic

designation. Thank you for your time, consideration of our request, and your service to our community.

**LAWING:** Thank you Mr. Fortier. Do board members have any questions of Mr. Fortier. Is any one in the audience wishing to address the board on this issue? Talkers please state your name and address for the record.

**DALE CHURCHMAN:** My name is Dale Churchman, 1357 S. Broadway. On behalf of the Board of Directors for the Historical Preservation Alliance, they voted last Sunday to support this motion and to urge that the park not be used for a school site because of damage to a historical environmental site. The only thing I would add that makes it even more historical I think is that there was a WPA Project, probably a civil works administration project to build a picnic facility, stage, seating for I think over 600 people, which I think adds to the historical significance to the park.

**LAWING:** Thank you Mr. Churchman, anyone else in the audience wishing to address the board on this issue. Please state your name and address for the record.

**LOIS ANN NEWMAN:** Lois Ann Newman I live at 2112 S. Topeka, I am here today on behalf of the South Central Progressive Association a neighborhood group which is quite large. It is from Kellogg to Pawnee and from the river to Hydraulic, which on the east side is Linwood Park. We have had a lot of good things happen in that part of the City, but it seems as though, lately what we have had are people who want to take our parks from us. We finally managed to get Lincoln Park taken care of, and the City is going to come in and do something what I call the Water Exchange of the river and to see what they can do with Gilbert and Mosley, and now from what I hear the school board wants to take part of that park. We don't have enough parks for the people we have. I am not against education, and neither is the neighborhood association, because we try to help the schools in our area there, but I would strongly hope that you would support not just the neighborhood but also the whole City in that they want to keep what is the park system. They would like to have more of it. There are some other schools around the City that have been closed that could house these children, while the land that Linwood sits on could be raised and rebuilt on that same land. It is just my hope that not only would you put this on the National Register, but that you would put the whole park or as much of it as possible, because it has been there in that form for quite a few years. I know when CPO started in 1975 it also came under fire at that time because of the highway that was going through there and they took some area away from the park at that time. Little by little, it gets chipped away. Lets stop the chipping and go no further. Thank you.

**LAWING:** Thank you Ms. Newman. While we have another speaker coming to the podium I just want to, before you began your remarks, I want to remind the members of the board and the members of the audience; Historic Preservation Board is not here to judge merit as to whether or not a school should be necessarily located in Linwood Park. I believe the request is to designating Linwood Park as a landmark. I just wanted to remind everyone.

(tape messed up) trying to fix.

**CROWLEY:** I live at 5706 E. 20<sup>th</sup>; I am a member of the Wichita School Board. I came today to find out how historic Linwood Park was because I am a Wichitan for 26 years now and I had never been in Linwood Park. I did not know it existed. I was only aware of South Linwood Park. One of the things I would like to correct was a few of Ms. Newman's comments because they were incorrect and I don't want that to continue. It is not true. First when the bond issue passed and many people here probably voted for it, because our children need better schools, they want neighborhood schools. When you get to a neighborhood that is highly developed there is not a lot of extra space. So we looked around and tried to find a place where we would not bulldoze peoples' houses, but provide enough space that is required by Federal requirements, if you are going to build school these days, it takes a lot more space than it used too in 1890. We are between a rock and a hard place, trying to find enough space to put a school on that will meet all of the requirements, especially keeping a neighborhood school for the Linwood area. I mean I think every neighborhood wants to keep their neighborhood school. There is not going to be any net lose of parks space at all. In fact we will be trading the Linwood Park space for, well this is kind of another conundrum as for example when the tornado came through and hit Griffenstein, that building was demolished so we are going to clear that land as part of the trade and have a new park in south Wichita. Where the Griffenstein School used to sit, in addition to that, there is another park called Wildwood, which is owned by the School District, but used by the Park Department. The neighborhood wants to build a shelter on it and the City won't do it until they own it. This is part of the trade. First I want to correct that impression, there will be not net loss of parkland. The second thing is; the statement that Lois Ann made, that other schools could house those children and that is not true. If it were true it would be wonderful, but as you know during the bond issue we have such decrepit buildings and we have not been able to maintain them there is no other places those kids could go. In fact, along the Broadway corridor, we

are having increasing numbers of poor children and we need more school space, especially along the Broadway corridor. So I wanted to correct that impression. The School District has started the discussion with the neighborhood. Since I work for neighborhoods for my living I know that everybody, you have to protect our neighborhood and your quality of life, but I would beg you all to sit back and think about the quality of life for the families that are going to live in your neighborhood in the future. Maybe it is not North Linwood, maybe we need to talk about other places, but if you want to keep neighborhood schools in neighborhoods just like grandfather Schweiter did, he traded for land on Douglas, and he meet the need of the growing community, maybe we need to think about doing that in 2001. Thank you.

**LAWING:** Thank you for your remarks, again, I want to make this point; I really do not want this discussion to go into the merits of whether or not a school needs to be located; if we need a new neighborhood school, if it needs to be located in North Linwood Park, South Linwood Park or on the current site. The request before this Preservation Board pertains to North Linwood Park, making it a Historic Designated Property. I have a lot of respect for Mrs. Crowley and for the work she has done, not only for the school board but with neighborhoods over the years and I urge the neighborhoods and the School District along with the City of Wichita to try to come together and solve any differences they have on this issue. However, it is not in the purview of the Historic Preservation Board to decide one way or another on the merits or where a school should be sited. The request is for us to consider nominating North Linwood Park as a designated landmark. Therefore, with that I welcome any other speakers to come forward to speak on this issue, but again, we are not going to debate whether or not a school is going to be located on this site. Just what we are talking about here, if it is going to be designated as a landmark. Could you please state your name and address for the record?

**JEANETTE PAXTON:** My name is Jeanette Paxton, I live at 1417 South Kansas, I had my comments directed to ask until all these comments about the school board came up and I though I would like to go to the school board and address many of these comments. I will try to keep the ones for this board here. When I took a class at WSU, called Wichita History taught by Dr. Craig Minor; and he taught out of his own textbook called "Wichita, the Magic City." Many points have already been made from that book and I won't go over that. However, one of the concepts that he taught in his class was that we are prone to think of prairie progressivism. By that I mean, if you have the idea of prairie progressivism you can be like Tamara Cottoner, Assistant Superintendent of Schools and look at Linwood Park and say; just barren land, just barren land that is what it is to the school board, just barren land. How can they be expected to appreciate \$3,000,000 dollars worth of trees and hundreds of years worth of history, if they could look at Linwood Park and say "just barren land". That is all I have to say.

**LAWING:** Thank you Mrs. Paxton, I would ask that if we have any future speakers to definitely reframe from any personal attacks, this is not the place for them.

**PAXTON:** This is not a personal attacks; it is just saying what was in the paper. When I heard today and what I heard on TV as well.

**LAWING:** I understand that there is a lot of emotion around this issues and I appreciate that. The fact that so many of you have joined us today even if you do not get up to speak, definitely speaks volumes, your presence definitely does that. We understand how strong some of your feelings are about this issue. Again, I do not want this forum to become a debate by the school or by the school administration to respond to any issues brought up here other than the fact that we are considering nominating this Park as a Historic Landmark. Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to address the board? Seeing none, I will bring the discussion back up to the board. Staff, Kathy do you have anything to add on this issue?

**MORGAN:** No, other than I did pull the records that we have on that piece of property and based on the criteria that we have for nomination of properties to the local register and potentially listing at least at the State level, this property does support those criteria.

**LAWING:** Go ahead Bryan.

**BARR:** What are the criterias?

**MORGAN:** The property has to be a least 50 years old or older, which this park is documented, dedicated to the City as a park in 1887; that is on the plat map which we have a copy of that to support that. Also it is documented the significant part of the history, is documented significant contribution that Henry Schweiter made to this community and also something that Mr. Fortier failed to mention was there was also another park associated with Henry

Schweiter and that is Henry Park and Hyde Park, is that not correct Paul? He was also involved with that.

**FORTIER:** No actually the Lincoln Street addition, which included the plat and dedication abutting into the dedication of Henry Park which was originally Henry Street Park that area was developed by Mr. Hyde and my great grandfather Henry Schweiter and George Burns in partnership. Hyde Park was the doing of strictly Mr. Hyde, where as the Henry Park was the combination.

**MORGAN:** There are actually three parks worth looking into for designation for meeting that burden or threshold of significance because of association with families that dedicated it and meeting the 50-year requirement. There is probably more information that could be documented regarding the landscaping technique etc. that would there again support the significance of those parks.

**LAWING:** Now Kathy, lets talk about the process here. It is my understanding that the board is being asked by Mr. Fortier and member of this neighborhood to nominate this or are they nominating this property. And if so who, I am trying to figure out, because the way I read the guidelines and the ordinance there are some specific things that I am not sure if they have been meet at this time.

**MORGAN:** It is my understanding with the ordinance, what Mr. Fortier is asking the Historic Preservation Board to consider this property for listing. It is the purview of this board to nominate properties that are deemed significant, now a portion of that completely process is that the property owner; and in this instance; it is the City of Wichita, support that nomination. It would be my recommendation to the board; should they so desire; to instruct Preservation staff to work with the Fortier and the neighborhood groups to develop the Nomination form that we have to submit. Our intention; the boards intention in writing is to the City Council; that with recommendation that this be also presented to the State Sites Review Committee for potential listing in the State register.

**LAWING:** Any other questions of staff?

**SHELDON:** What other parks of this sorts are in the City? Are they listed?

**MORGAN:** We have no other parks other than Grove Park, which is a local listed site for archeological purposes, but it is a local listed park. Painted turtle is also an archeological site, but it is not a park, it is a site and there is no park development. Therefore, Grove is the only other park that is in use as a park that is also under this board's review.

**GUY:** It occurs to that many of us have considered that parks shouldn't have to be nominated and protected. Simply by virtue of being parks and they are. If we are going to have to revisit that, we should start right away. Because I myself live near several historic parks, Central Riverside Park, which once was Waterman's Grove, North River Side Park, and Oak Park, Griffenstein Park, which was dedicated in the 1890 by another founder of the City of Wichita. All of these parks, Paula Jones Park which was of course part of the Country Park, I imagine I could come up with some other parks, but the point is...

**WILLENBERG:** Sims Park,

**GUY:** Yes Sims Park, thank you very much, and there are red fox in Sims Park, a wonderful place, but perhaps we should be considering along with the nomination of some kind, of these unquestionable historic parks, so that they can be indeed be protected. The thing that sets an old park from a new park, several things; but one of them is history. One of them is the fact that certain things have been going on in this place for a very long time; for example, my family has been having family reunions every two years in North Linwood Park since 1908 that I know of, I have some photographs. These things become part of the traditions of Wichitans. Not to mention the very obvious things, the wonderful brick pavements that you find in the splendid variety of trees that have been there for a very long time. You are not going to find those in a new park. It seems to me that the business of this board is to protect them wherever we may. So while I certainly believe and I am going to make a motion, while I certainly believe that Linwood Park needs to be listed, I think we also need to look into the listing of some of the other Historic Parks so that this issue will not occur again. For the reasons that have been presented, and for the reasons that I have so briefly pointed out to you. I would move that we instruct staff to work with Mr. Fortier and the neighborhood to prepare the nomination for North Linwood Park and that we bring it back to this body for approval and for sending it to the City Council for the City of Wichita with our recommendations that they react upon it quickly.

**LAWING:** We have a motion on the floor, do we have a second?

**AMENDED MOTION #7** (Guy: Motioned)  
(Sheldon 2nd) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** We have an amended motion on the table? We have a second to the amended motion do we have any further discussion signify by saying aye, opposed nays, the motion carries. Jim, do you want to second the motion?

**GUY:** My second motion would be that we instruct staff to review the history of the park and determine which parks might likewise be worthy of nomination and bring that list back to us for further consideration.

**LAWING:** We have a motion on the table, do we have a second.

**AMENDED MOTION #8** (Guy: Motioned)  
(Edgington 2nd) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** We have a second by Edgington, do we have any discussion?

**SHELDON:** I have a discussion, this I think gets back to one of your opening statements about this issue being a park in the first place; there kind of a public trust almost in the fact that it is a public park and it will stay that way, at least that is the assumption that most people are under. This feels like a very awkward situation to say the least that we are being put in. It seems inappropriate to a certain extent and I'm not exactly sure I'm just talking about this at this point or that we are being placed in a point of last chance. Either we have to do something or somebody else is going to take this something away from us as apposed to being done in a more proactive since years ago because this was just something that we needed to do. I guess there is just a part of this, where it seems like something that is missing here in this process in that; in that we could keep this and let this be what it is, great, in the big scheme of things, I just don't quite see it. I appreciate the fact that we are not here to debate whether this is a good site for a school or not, but there is some reality of what is happening. That we have been put in an awkward position and I don't think it is very appropriate. I am not sure how to address that here, that is just my feeling.

**GUY:** I know why you are uncomfortable, I think, I am too; it is because we assume some things, we always attend to assume. Like so many time I talk to the group here about brick streets. We ought to have a climatic nomination of brick streets, well is always the response, the manager is saying now days when we are replacing bricks, indeed that is what is happening, so we don't think about brick streets anymore, we don't have too, you never think about something you have until it is in danger of disappearing. A couple of years ago because of the Kellogg Expansion, we added a sculptural nomination, we have never had one of those, and we passes that with flying colors, but again that was because of perhaps of loss. It is unfortunate that we are brought into these things due to the threat of loss, but so much better that than not at all.

**SHELDON:** I also have a little difficulty understanding our role in a landscape type situation. To be honest with you not to say that there are not lots of significant things about parks that make them wonderful; the landscaping is a very significant part of that structure, but we are talking about the park as opposed to the structure on the park or something else. Again it is just an issue I have a hard time justifying or understand what I need to even know even as an architect about that to make it a descent, fair, just vote. I'm kind of about this.

**LAWING:** Stan I appreciate your comments and I have to admit, I share an certain uneasiness with you about this as well, obviously, we are talking about an issue that several groups are looking at and in their minds the position they have is for the quality of life for the communities for improving that. Obviously there is a need to pay attention and to put some resources into our education system, but part of my uneasiness, I think it relates to some of the comments that were made, that maybe we should have designated North Linwood Park years ago. Maybe this is a discussion that should have come up years ago, but I think our point about the fact, that you don't think about these things until you loose them, or until they are in jeopardy you take them for granted that might be the situation in this case. Along those lines all I can say is that I would hope that the school district, the City officials from Wichita and the neighborhood, friends of North Linwood Park, that association can really get together and try to come up with a solution that will benefit all parties involved, that is easier said than done. As far as the issue goes of designating landscape as historic; there was a presentation at the conference that we had in April a discussion by one of the keynote speakers that pertained to Courthouse squares of smaller towns; and that the Midwest is famous for. The fact that these trees and the layouts were not haphazardly done, that there was a purpose behind

that, as a result of that with some of the natural flora and plants that have furbished there, that does become a historical significant somewhat. This is a different though the traditional historic preservation aspect of it. There is a question, that is a new development and I guess, I have not totally shaped my opinion on that, I do think there is some merit worth looking into it. The question before us, the motion that has been made is one about the designation about this park. I think Jim part of your motion was to be proactive and maybe direct historical staff to look at the historical significance of other parks as well, so that we will go ahead and get them on the list now as opposed as to having this kind of issue come up later if we so feel that is the case. I am uncomfortable because I feel we are in a situation that we have to react and it is going to benefit one group or to the detriment of another group and I am very torn on that issue. All of us on this board are very interested in the history and the preservation of it otherwise; we would not be here right now. Linwood Park is a beautiful park and some of those trees are much older than any of us in this room and will out live most of us in this room. I think that is historical significant. With that being said we have a motion on the table, discussion is still open by board members, does anyone else have any comments?

**SHELDON:** Certainly looking at natural resources which is something that grown environment vs. the built environment; like you said there is typically a mind set behind what occurs especially to so many non-native species being brought in, or the mentality why you bring a species into an area that generally does not welcome the forrest by any measure. What my concern was before we move forward so fast; that we don't realize the criteria by which we are judged on all of this and end up regretting that later. In addition, I'd like to look at the precedence of WPA Projects being listed. I certainly doubt this is the only site.

**LAWING:** Maybe your request in addition to Jim's motion that we extend the scope not only to the parks, but to other WPA projects in the region.

**MORGAN:** Are you talking about WPAs in parks or WPA Projects throughout the City?

**GUY:** Very good.

**SHELDON:** Well at least a survey.

**WILLENBERG:** Is this something we have to vote on today or could we have an emergency meeting in two weeks to review more thoroughly?

**MORGAN:** I guess if you are asking me if staff can have all the documentation all together in two weeks, I would say that is improbable, not impossible, but improbable, particular adding WPA information, the history of the park system could be readily accessed and something put together.

**WILLENBERG:** What I was thinking; if we expanded the motion to not do WPA at this point but to bring it up at the next meeting or as a separate motion.

**MORGAN:** Or maybe as a separate survey of the parks, it could be listed in there as to whether they are WPA or CCC Projects in the parks themselves.

**WILLENBERG:** What would make me more comfortable, I don't know about anyone else; if we expand the motion to include all parks, that we deem after some more review, more information that might have some historical signification. Bring it back sooner than a month from now and we can vote on it at that time. I don't feel prepared, because this is a different type of situation.

**LAWING:** I think Jim's motion was; lets go back to that for a moment, you were not asking us to approve designation, but to direct staff to work on the nomination form.

**WILLENBERG:** Excellent.

**LAWING:** It is still going to come back to us.

**GUY:** With lots of information to add.

**WILLENBERG:** Good, so can we just expand that to include all City Parks?

**GUY:** If we act quickly we won't need to do that, or should that be a separate issue?

**WILLENBERG:** I would feel more comfortable if we were doing the whole scope, rather than a band-aid document.

**GUY:** My thought was of course to put the band-aid on be sure that we don't have to use it again.

**WILLENBERG:** Either way can work.

**LAWING:** I think that as much controversy as this issue has and the fact that it need to move we really need to address this without delay, now whether it's band-aide or not, so the chair would recommend that you might want to amend your motion into two separate motions. Jim so why don't you amend your motion.

**GUY:** My first motion would be that we instruct staff to proceed at once to prepare a nomination form for North Linwood Park and to return it to us for further consideration at the next meeting of this board.

**LAWING:** We have an amended motion on the table.

**MOTION #9** Amended Motion (Guy: Motioned)  
(Sheldon 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**LAWING:** We have a second to the amended motion, any discussion? All in favor signify that by saying aye, opposed, nay, motion carries. Jim do you want make a second motion on this?

**GUY:** My second motion would be that we instruct staff to review the history of the park system and determine which parks might likewise be worthy of nomination and to bring that list back to us for further consideration.

**LAWING:** We have a motion on the table, is there a 2nd?

**MOTION #10** Motion (Guy: Motioned)  
(Willenberg 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**WILLENBERG:** Second by Willenberg.

**LAWING:** We have a second by Willenberg, any discussion?

**SHELDON:** If that included looking at the review process I am sure.

**WILLENBERG:** Will there be a third motion for WPA Projects?

**GUY:** I will leave that for you Claire.

**LAWING:** We have a motion on the table and a second, any discussion, all in favor signify by saying aye, nay, the ayes have it. We have something floating out here do we want to talk about WPA now or in the future?

**WILLENBERG:** I think we should do it now.

**LAWING:** Okay Claire.

**WILLENBERG:** It was your idea, and excellent idea, would you like to present the motion.

**LAWING:** Bryan do you want to make the motion?

**BARR:** I have to start somewhere; I would motion to take a look at WPA Projects with in our bounds to review.

**GUY:** Kathy would that WPA and CCC?

**BARR:** And any like organizations for possible historic nominations.  
(Can't hear what is being said tape 2 side 1).

**LAWING:** We have a motion on the table, is there a second?

**MOTION #11**

Motion (Barr: Motioned)

(Guy 2<sup>nd</sup>) Motion carried unanimously (6-0) Approved

**GUY:** Guy seconds the motion.

**LAWING:** Any discussion all in favor signify by saying aye, nay. The ayes have it. Kathy, are we done on this issue for now?

**MORGAN:** I believe so. A copy of the minutes will be provided to the City Manager and the City Council of this action so they will be served notice that the board is considering designation of Parks, etc. The only thing I would ask is if we could use the Fortier since they have the history of Linwood Park, if maybe we could get in touch later on in the week; set something up so that we can start putting this information together. And certainly anybody else, interested in that I will try to set up meetings whereby you can be notified that we are working on pulling together the information for this nomination.

**LAWING:** Mr. Fortier we will be in touch with Kathy and with others to get this nomination completed. I would like to thank everyone for coming today. I appreciate your patience. We understand the emotions that run deep on this issue, we appreciate that and hope that we can find a compromise that will not only work for the neighborhood but also for the City at large. Thanks you very much. We have a couple more issues before us, some additions to the agenda.

*2. Statewide Tax Credit Conference, September 12, Kansas Museum of History in Topeka*

**MORGAN:** I will try to help with registration of \$30 dollars to attend the Tax Credit Conference in Topeka in September. I can get a city vehicle to provide transportation up there and back, but I need to know by August 31, 2001 on that.

**LAWING:** Lets check our calendars and if anyone is willing to go let Kathy know at our August meeting.

**WILLENBERG:** Is there a chance that they will have one in Wichita later?

**MORGAN:** Not that I'm aware of. There has been discussion between our office and the State office regarding the review of the Tax Credit Projects. I have two developers that want to take advantage of this. The state office had at one time had approached me about creating a review committee for these tax credit projects so that we could do those locally and if we could do that they were going to give us the application fee. There will be an application fee associated with these projects. That will be determined, they are still working out the regulations on the tax credits, and so, we are thinking by mid September this should be in place. I would think if they were going to do something like that and we do get an agreement to do that they would come down here and do some trainings. It would be my understanding that instead of having the whole board review something like that, that it would be a sub-committee of the board that would handle those reviews.

**WILLENBERG:** Do we need to look at our Design Review Committee?

**MORGAN:** Generally that is a standing group. We had the president and one other person and then a floater.

**WILLENBERG:** I was the floater.

**MORGAN:** Right Claire you were the floater, and then it was Paul and Randal.

**LAWING:** So we had three with one alternate?

**MORGAN:** No we had two with one alternate. So, by virtue, you would be one of the two permanent ones.

**LAWING:** I would like to have someone with a high level of expertise in our architectural matters, so I would ask Stan to serve on that.

**SHELDON:** That is do-able.



**MORGAN:** Then as an alternate I could just call between the other board members and say it is your turn or are you available.

**LAWING:** I think in the last years the Design Review Committee met maybe two or three times. It is not much of a time burden at all.

**SHELDON:** Can we have a general talk about this Park issue right quick? One thing I have been thinking about since we had that issue come up today. As an architect, there are some really significant things that are very important about landscape architectural parks in general, that is a very significant issue. I do think there is a drastic difference through between a City square, associated with like a courthouse, or City Hall that was very encompassing in terms of a feature that it was apart of some, either building project or some significant street intersections or something of that kind vs. general saying that we are designating an entire park area. And so that was part of my thinking, as I was sitting here I can articulate a little bit better as apposed to saying it is just grass and trees in an area, because the oldness of a tree is just not something, I understand that you don't have a 150 tree in one day.

**MORGAN:** It might help to think of it in this way Stan, that it is not unusual because the park is an integral part of how a neighborhood develops; so it's that open space and how the neighborhood development around it, also that substantiate maybe you would consider designation something like that, it is not uncommon for that to happen. It is just that we have not done it here in Wichita.

**GUY:** If you think about it Stan, Griffenstein was the first person that was a real-estate developer that included the concept of a park as a sort of a common part of his development. This is a normal approach and he did it later that Mr. Schweiter, did for example. It was not only integral to the neighborhood but to the design to like five additions to the City of Wichita. If you start looking at that and how it came about, Waterman's Grove for example became Central Riverside Park at one time; have you ever noticed the sidewalk that goes around there around the street, that was a race track at one time.

**WILLENBERG:** All the way around.

**GUY:** Yes, that was developed by Colonel Murrell Murdock for batting purposes, so again not only do we have association with founders and with neighborhoods, but certain things that are integral to the history of the City.

**LAWING:** And let me just state something, I think Bryan kind of hit on it earlier and staff I think all around the edges. We need to have criteria established. It can't be more than we have an old tree here, lets save it. If it is contributed to the development of the City in some positive way, I see what you are talking about. The landscape architect maybe around the courthouse is different from the park perse. But while we are doing this, and if we are going to do the other parks and structures, I do think we have to come up with a firm set of criteria's like Bryan said so that we aren't just necessarily of bastion of last resort to the Neighborhood Associations wanting to protect something in their area.

**WILLENBERG:** North High is looking at Minisa Park. I will be on that fight over there.

**LAWING:** Again, and I think it is unfortunate that we would have to be arbiter in those kinds of issues, when they should be dealt with prior. What there should be and what we do not have on this board is a specific criteria for land that we are going to designate for Historic purposes

**SHELDON:** My guess is we do not need to come up with this; there is a criteria already out there.

**GUY:** It is out there.

**SHELDON:** We need to know it, we or I was barely aware of it at this point.

**WILLENBERG:** I know, I did not feel competent to vote today either. Kathy, are there other surrounding towns that we know of in Kansas or Missouri that might have something?

**MORGAN:** Certainly Missouri, I'm sure Kansas City has, I'm thinking that St Joseph Missouri has their parkway designated, or protected in some form or fashion.

**WILLENBERG:** Now realistically, how receptive will the City be to designate parks?

**MORAGN:** I can't answer that question, I have no idea.

**BRYAN:** What resource protection measures are already in place with the Park Board?

**MORGAN:** Nothing that I am aware of.

**LAWING:** Well they have something, I'm sure that there are some guidelines there that they have to purvey to deed land to deed land back to the City for different uses which at some time they did at Linwood Park with the Harry Street and the I-135 expansion. Again I think we are all working a little in the dark and we need some more information so that we can maybe set a precedent or develop a policy that we would like to see followed.

**GUY:** The other thing, we need to think about this as part of that team, is the scope of review on landscape matters. We certainly don't necessarily want to be the people that the Park Department consults every time that they want to plant a new strand of Oak Trees. That would drive them insane and drive us mad. But at the same time and at the other end of the spectrum if a park is going to cease to be a park in part or in whole then I think we should have something to say about the use that effects the

**WILLENBERG:** How restrictive is a designation park?

**MORGAN:** It would be just like, what you would be looking at would be any structures that are build and any maintaining existing structures. Maybe if they had to put a road through the park for some reason for access you would look at that. To look at the landscaping and all of that stuff what you are doing is saying that this is a historic significant site because of it's associated with Henry Schweiter; it is not necessarily the fact it has been a park since 1887. It is a fact that it is associated with Henry Schweiter, who was the founder of this community. It would be like nominating a structure; it is not architecturally significant but it is significant because of who was associated with it.

**LAWING:** Kathy, I think as far as my vote today that we at least pursue a nomination and have you work with them, just because I am somewhat comfortable on that level. However, at the same time I share some of Stan, sentiments that we are getting into un-chartered waters here. This is an issue that again, it might be before us with Claire who said on the other side of the table and we need to get our act together as soon as possible, so that we are not acting on a case by case basis's. We need to have something into place that the public knows about and the School District, the City, the County, or developers whomever; knows that this is the approach we are taking to these types of problems. Again we have a lot of various players, I don't know how the Park Board is going to take to all of this.

**WILLENBERG:** That is why I wondered how restrictive it became?

**SHELDEN:** It seems that trees die, and we want to replant things; they have to replace

**WILLENBERG:** We shouldn't be involved in that. Does it really keep them from deeding part of the Park away?

**MORGAN:** This is a legal battle between the City and any heirs; any parkland dedicated to the City...Generally there is something called a reversionary clause in there. It has to be determined if that park ceases to exist as a park, generally what happens is that that land reverts to the heirs and assigns the original owner. We are not getting into that. What we are saying, the board is saying here is that this property is significant to the history of City of Wichita because of its continued use as a Park since 1887 and the fact that it was Henry Schweiter who dedicated that land to the City as a Park.

**GUY:** As I think about this, there are two parks that I know of that have reversionary clauses; one is Sims Park, and this one; but there are great many others that are historically significant parks which were not on the list; like Griffenstein Park in Riverside Park.

**WILLENBERG:** Isn't that the shelter house that is?

**MORGAN:** No, there are no park structures that are locally designated.

**GUY:** Really, I thought there was one in Central Riverside.

**MORGAN:** No. It is on the undesignated list but it is not designated.

**WILLENBERG:** That is so historically significant.

**LAWING:** This issue has opened a huge can of worms here, but they are issues that need to be addressed when we are talking about, for development, wanting to be a catalysts, we do need to get our arms around this issue. Any other business before the board at this time, I would entertain a motion that we adjourn.

3. *National Trust annual Conference, October 16-21, Providence, Rhode Island*

**MORGAN:** I have received information about the National Trust Conference; it is going to be in Providence Road Island on October 16-21, 2001.

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board adjourned at 5:00 p.m.